

(2)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION NO.....2314.....OF 2001.

PETITIONER MANJU WADHWANI.
D/O Shri Vidaypal Wadhwani.
aged 21 years,R/O Adarsh colony,
Bilaspur.(C.G).

2333
S. M. Shrivastava
31/12/01

verses

RESPONDENT

1. The state of chhattisgarh.
through secretary Education
department, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The registrar,Guru Ghasidas
University, Bilaspur.(C.G.)
3. The Principal,D.P.Vipra P.G. College,
Bilaspur.(C.G)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THECONSTITUTION OF INDIA

DETAILS OF THE PETITION

ED COPY.
4:10:01
A.G. BILASPUR

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(17)

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.No.2314/ सन् 2001

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	04.12.2001 Heard Smt.Anju Ahuja, learned counsel for the petitioner. Heard also Shri Rajeev Shrivastava, learned Panel Lawyer for the respondent No.1 / State. None represents the respondents No.2 and 3 today. This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed as the petitioner is not satisfied with revaluation result and she is still hopeful that if the papers are once again evaluated, she might get more marks. It is stated after the revaluation, she got 23 more marks when compared with the original mark sheet. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that there was a great difference of marks between the first valuation and the revaluation. It is submitted that if the papers are once again revaluated, the petitioner could get more marks. Shri Rajeev Shrivastava submits at the bar that once revaluation has been done, it will not be permissible to keep on allowing further valuation simply because the student is not satisfied with the marks allotted in the revaluation.	

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

In my view, in exercise of extra-ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot keep on issuing direction to revaluate the answer scripts of students and particularly in the present case, since the revaluation was already done, it is not open to the student to ask for further direction to revaluate. Such exercise of power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, in my view will not be in the best interes of justice. I hold that there is no further scope to issue direction for revaluation.

Accordingly, the petition fails and the same is dismissed.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

15 12-01